

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-13, 17, 19-26, 28-33, 37, 39, 40, and 48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent 7,177,329 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180).

Claims 7, 18, 27, and 38 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 13,-15 of U.S. Patent 7,177,329 in view of Wolf et al. (U.S. 6,914,637 B1).

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-13, 17, 19-26, 28-33, 37, 39, 40, and 48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent 7,068,682 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification.

Claims 7, 18, 27, and 38 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent 7,068,682 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification as applied above, further in view of Wolf et al. (U.S. 6,914,637 B1).

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 21, 22, 24-26, and 48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent 7,487,273 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 21, 22, 24-26 and 48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11/726,350 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 21, 22, 24-26 and 48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11/726,895 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, 21, 22, 24, 28, 32, and 48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11/747,844 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 21, 22, 24-26 and 48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11/776,411 in view of Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and Universal Serial Bus Specification.

Please note that neither Application No. 11/726,350 nor 11/726,895 are assigned to, or were ever assigned to, the assignee of the present application. Applicant respectfully believes that the Examiner has made a typographical error as neither of those two patent applications is even in the same technical field as the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this issue be clarified or the rejections be withdrawn.

Note also that a Terminal Disclaimer was already filed for U.S. Patent 7,177,329 with the Amendment filed on May 28, 2009.

As to the other double patenting rejections, properly executed Terminal Disclaimers accompany this response. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the double patenting rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 18, 19, 21-23, 29, 38, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055) (as evidenced by Universal Serial Bus Specification and MPEG-2 Transmission) in view of Universal Serial Bus Specification, and Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180).

Claims 8, 10, 13, 28, 30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055), and Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) as applied above to claims 1 and 21, further in view of Wolf et al. (U.S. 6,914,637).

Claims 9, 18, 19, 29, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055), and Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) as applied above to claims 1 and 21, further in view of MPEG-2 Transmission.

Claims 11, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055), and Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) as applied above to claims 1 and 21, further in view of Wolf et al. (U.S. 6,914,637) and Klingman (U.S. 6,219,736).

Claims 12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055), and Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) as applied above to claims 1 and 21, further in view of Yin (U.S. 2008/0175277).

Claims 20 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055), and Enami et al. (U.S. 2004/0221180) and MPEG-2 Transmission, as applied above to claims 19 and 39, in view of Roberts (U.S. 4,796,203).

Claims 1-2, 4-13, 17-20, 23, 41-43, and 45-48 have been cancelled. New claims 49-63 have been added. The Applicant's response will focus on the remaining claims.

As to claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests "wherein the unidirectional main link line is only capable of sending data in one direction by virtue of it being connected to a transmitter but not a receiver at a video source device end and being connected to a receiver but not a transmitter at a video display device end." The Examiner admits that the Ooshima reference fails to teach a unidirectional main link line. See Office Action, page 28. The Examiner relies on the Universal Serial Bus Specification (referred to as D1 in the office action) as allegedly teaching a unidirectional main link line. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner points to pages 20, 44, 48 of the USB Specification as allegedly teaching a unidirectional main link line. These sections describe that unidirectional pipes may be defined within the USB standard. However, these pipes are virtual pipes within a physical USB line. The physical USB line is bi-directional. What the reference is saying is that unidirectional sessions may be conducted over the USB line. See page 20 ("The USB supports functional data and control exchange between the USB host and a USB device as a set of either uni-directional or bi-directional pipes. USB data transfers take place between host software and a particular endpoint on a USB device. Such associations between the host software and a USB device endpoint are called pipes. In general, data movement through one pipe is independent from the data flow in any other pipe. A given USB device may have many pipes. As an example, a given USB device could have an endpoint that supports a pipe for transporting data to the USB device and another endpoint that supports a pipe for transporting data from the USB device.")

While these sessions, or "pipes", may be unidirectional, Applicant respectfully disagrees that this means that the physical line itself is unidirectional. Simply put, the fact that a bidirectional line can be used to transmit only in one direction does not mean that the line ceases to be a bidirectional line. As long as the line is capable of being used in both directions, it is a bidirectional line, whether or not it is actually used that way.

Nevertheless, in order to speed prosecution, claim 21 has been amended to explicitly recite that the unidirectional main link line is only capable of sending data in one direction by virtue of it being connected to a transmitter but not a receiver at a video source device end and being connected to a receiver but not a transmitter at a video display device end. This clearly differentiates the claimed invention from the USB Specification, as in USB the USB line is connected to a USB transmitter and receiver on both ends, and thus is capable of bidirectional

communication, regardless of the fact that there may be certain times where data is only sent in one direction.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

As to independent claim 49, this claim includes a receiver unit connected to the bidirectional auxiliary channel line but not connected to the unidirectional main link line. This differs from the cited prior art because, as described above, in the USB standard both sides of the USB line are attached to both a transmitter and a receiver. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 49 is in condition for allowance.

As to independent claim 59, this claim includes a transmitter unit connected to the bidirectional auxiliary channel line but not connected to the unidirectional main link line. This differs from the cited prior art because, as described above, in the USB standard both sides of the USB line are attached to both a transmitter and a receiver. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 59 is in condition for allowance.

As to independent claim 62, this claim indicates that “the unidirectional main link line is only capable of sending data in one direction by virtue of it being connected to a transmitter but not a receiver at a video source device end and being connected to a receiver but not a transmitter at a video display device end.” This is similar to the element described above with respect to claim 21 and thus Applicant respectfully submits that claim 62 is in condition for allowance for the same reason as described above with respect to claim 21.

As to independent claims 56 and 63, these claims do not explicitly state the element described above, but do indicate that the main link line is unidirectional. Applicant maintains that the term “unidirectional” with respect to a line should be interpreted as meaning “the line is only capable of communications in a single direction.” As such, these claims are allowable over the cited prior art, as USB lines are capable of communications in both directions.

Dependent claims 22, 24-33, 37-40, 50-55, 57-58, and 60-61 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claim, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references. For at least these reasons, claims 22, 24-33, 37-40, 50-55, 57-58, and 60-61 are not anticipated or made obvious by the prior art and/or the official notice outlined in the Office Action.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/
Marc S. Hanish
Registration No. 42,626

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
(408) 255-8001